

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/786,460	02/26/2004	Joseph R. Griffin	1110-308	9321	
6449 7:	590 10/17/2005		EXAMINER		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.			PASCHALL, MARK H		
1425 K STREE	T, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3742		

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/786,460	GRIFFIN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mark H. Paschall	3742				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover she	et with the correspondence ac	ddress			
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, r i. a reply within the statutory minimum riod will apply and will expire SIX (6 tatute, cause the application to beco	nay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered timel) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	· · · · · · · · ·					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,10-12,14 and 15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 3,7-9,13 and 16 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) The of References Cited (PTO-892) The of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) The of Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB The root No(s)/Mail Date 08-02-04.	Pape	view Summary (PTO-413) or No(s)/Mail Date oe of Informal Patent Application (PTO r:	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/786,460

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-2,4-6,10-12,14,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuya in view of Ikeda et al. Furuya teaches the claimed subject matter but does not set forth use of slope detection in the control process. The patent to Ikeda et al is applied for teaching that the rate of decrease in the detected temperature of the heating element in a mass flow sensor can be used to prevent thermal shock to the element and in view of this teaching it would have been obvious to modify the Furuya system with slope detection, to prevent against thermal shock to the sensor element. Since the power supply to the heater is prevented in Ikeda et al, in

Art Unit: 3742

response to slope detection, the power is prevented for a predetermined time, as claimed, this time being the time between the next periodic slope sensing time. As per claim 2 not ambient sensing is conventional as set forth in Ikeda et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3,7-9,13 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not teach open loop control after the predetermined time period.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Melgaard and Weibler et al are cited for disclosing heating control systems of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark H. Paschall whose telephone number is 703 308-1642. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am - 3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on (703) 305-5766. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/786,460

Art Unit: 3742

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark H Paschall Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742

mp